heurist Post author

September 4, 2014 at 12:26 am

I've published the video about 18 hours ago. Please go to https://www.youtube.com /watch?v=IUEwSmDzpMs to see it.

I'm posting important questions and my answers to them below.

It can also be found on Vimeo in HD:

Edit

Reply ↓

I fortunately have questions that I've answered about my video and publish them here for your review.

Question:
"structure: I don't know what to think here. Can you give an example?"
"vocabulary: Seem to indicate that it's all about text.
Right? because the information it creates from the data"
"information = data + structure"
"They could represent an individual symbol, punctuation, morpheme,lexeme, word, emotion,

perspective, or some other unit of information in the data."

Answer:
Collecting, organizing, summarizing.

Think of these concepts as 'enzymes'.
It's a given that the data stream exhibits some coherence. Data is only collected from a stream that's coherent in terms of itself. If a structure comes along that the 'enzymes' recognize, it will be summarized.
The video shows a holarchical acquisition of the data. Patterns are differentiated by their spectra. There are many harmonic fields working concurrently. Ultimately, the output of one level provides the input for a higher level unless they have reached their highest level.

Question:
"I got that. But still have a hard time to imagine something behind the term structure."

Answer:
Is my distinction between what an intrinsic and extrinsic property are clear? what they are. It depends upon that knowledge.
Meta-fields occupy higher levels of the holarchy. Hyper-fields occupy the intra- inter- and extra-spectral domains.
Reliability means that you arrive at a harmony between what the data is giving you is being represented.
Consistently means that no matter how the data is being parsed, you get the same results. Even if indeterminacy is part of the data.
Essentially infinity (or several of them) and any kind of ambiguity (even logical) are treated in a consistent way.

Question:
"hidden + missing K: I can imagine that if the structure K is supposed to have is known, then hidden and missing K become obvious. But what if the structure is unknown? (or in reality more complex – fractals e.g. when thinking about granularity here)"

Answer:
Knowledge that is hidden will show to have gaps in its structure that are partially covered [concealed]. Knowledge that is missing reveals itself by gaps that are not concealed. If the KR is done correctly, nothing can be hidden without being noticed at some level. The same is true about missing knowledge.
Perspective: how we look at knowledge depends to a very large extent upon how we see.

'Knowledge' without an FOV [Field of View] is a precursor to knowledge for those who lack one.

Question:
"Reliability + consistency is now OK. Your phrasing made my link these terms to the conceptualization of our world, not to the process."

Answer:
Knowledge's structure is never supposed, rather comes completely from the data and in the data's own terms. There is no need to create ontologies for the data, because the data provides them itself.

It may help if we chose an example.

Question:

if the knowledge's structure is solely coming from what is provided, I cannot see how detection of missing knowledge is triggered."
"unless it is combined with other existing knowledge"

Answer:
As the information accumulates patterns emerge. The patterns show inconsistency. Let's take *indeterminacy* as an example. I will then move to a omission and obfuscation/lying from there. Every kind of indeterminacy shares one or more harmonics with all others. It's signature is unmistakable no matter where it occurs. This is true of *any data. The same harmonic signatures can be known.* It's almost exactly like a chemical molecule (even compounds).
The holarchy of the signatures are arranged in increasing orders and express themselves as this same signature at a different 'octaves' sort of like how water running down the drain in your sink resembles a hurricane.
Omissions leave gaps in those spectral signatures.
Obfuscation and hiding produces partially distorted spectral signatures.

Lying produces partially inverted spectral signatures.

Question:
"Give me your definition of truth value please."
"Knowledge is true or false, justified or not: OK with that. But I cannot see why this is so because of your definition of knowledge (meaning of meaning) as indicated by the word because. Couldn't this be independent?"

Answer:
Truth value is a type of dynamics which is shared between entities. If the entities participate in any shared domain, then truth for them is found in the dynamics they share. Truth (intrinsically) is a field. Truth shares a contrapositional relationship to fiction which together build a complete harmonic structure capable of discerning truth value within a KR (knowledge representation). I also call them 'groks' (in honor of Robert Heinlein).

Question:
"In the first case (semantics)"
(Quoting me) There already exists knowledge structure and dynamics for objects we cannot or will not yet know. The same is true for objects to which meaning has not yet been assigned, such as ideas, connections and perspectives that we're not yet aware of or have forgotten. Their meaning is never clear until we've become aware of or remember them.
"I see sort of chicken-egg situation here. If things have no clear meaning, how can the meaning of meaning (knowledge) exist and have structure and dynamics?"

Answer:
If it were a chicken and egg situation, I would say that both arose together, but it isn't about that *artificially* created conundrum for me.

Structure, resonance and dynamics are inherent and unique in all that knowledge is.
Question:
(Quoting me) Things, concepts and other things exist without me knowing them (or have forgotten). Including their properties, connections.
"I fully agree with that."

"If I take your reference to perspective from the chat"
(quoting me) (Perspective: how we look at knowledge depends to a very large extent upon how we see),
then perspective doesn't exist for the things I'm not aware of. Right? I might have forgotten things and
their perspective(s), though."
"What is written in this paragraph gives the global idea of what you want to tell, I think, but the
phrasing brings up apparent inconsistencies at least for me."

Answer:
Knowledge to you *is* your perspective.
Perspectivity is a precursor of awareness.
Self and other is fundamental and manifests itself even at the quantum level. This is not my
opinion, rather a result from experimentation and research.

Question:
"You know I don't like ontologies, so this is not a defense of them."
"Observation: These two paragraphs feel like an aggression to ontologies, or at least an aspect of
them, that you do not mention. I think you should, else the reader must have that knowledge in order to
understand what you are refuting."
"E.g. 'incapable of generating the purpose of even its own inception'. Is that something what is said to
be necessary? For an ontology, for knowledge?"

Answer:
An ontology is like a set. An ontology requires a purpose for it to make sense. An ontology
without a purpose is like a set without an equation to define it. Membership within a set without
a purpose is useless. The *crucial question is who's determining their membership?*

The *conventional* use and understanding shows clearly how ontologies are useful, but their
purpose is implicitly defined by us or an algorithm (us again).
The *reality* is that an ontology is 'homeless' without an epistemology to share its 'domain' with. It
becomes more than a named set. *It is knowledge.*

Question:
"The last phrase is a very good one 'The knowledge is not coming from the data itself, it's always
coming from the observer of the data – even if that observer is an algorithm!' and would have a better
position earlier in the text."
"The same holds for the part of the next paragraph (Real knowledge …. increasing precision!)."
"You can look at an ontology, or what is commonly labeled 'knowledge graph', 'semantic network' etc
as just another stream of data. Handled in you chain of processes like any other stream of data
(acquisition, collation, …).'
"If you look at the definition of ontology the key phrase is "consensual description of a domain".
Nothing more."

Answer:
That is a qualified and contrived definition. Why must we accept it? It belongs to a paradigm
that has shown to be only capable of *synthetic intelligence* (AI).
I know I'm alone right now in my knowledge, but it won't stay that way. People who are silently
understanding me without the courage to speak out in solidarity with me are reading this right
now.

There will come a time when even the subscribers to the incomplete paradigm of Artificial Intelligence will say 'We've always known we had an incomplete metaphysics to back us up.' This isn't about intelligence for those who finance the industry of AI anyway, they have even bigger fish to fry… our sovereignty and freedom.
Until that day, I will stand as the only voice for reason… at least until others are honest with themselves and join me.

Question:
"What is knowledge then (and the list)"
"Observation: The 3 bold items seem to be the key statements of your definition of knowledge. The other elements are precisions on the bold topic above. But presenting it like this doesn't show that clearly."
"'These requisites of awareness' shouldn't I read here 'These requisites of knowledge' or 'This awareness'?"

Answer:
The requisites of awareness are the prerequisites for knowledge.

Question:
Now about "knowledge can be precisely defined':"
"In your decription (the list and their precisions) the term 'knowledge' is precisely defined. It is your definition."
"If this affirmation includes also knowledge itself I'm struggling with the term 'precisely'."
"In my perception 'awareness' and 'meaning' (and thus meaning of meaning = knowledge) include a personal aspect (human or software) because is uses prior knowledge. (BTW there is the question of how to start from a blank sheet here). If this is so then the term "precisely" might refer to individual internal knowledge."

Answer:
Meaning builds, in all of its multitude of forms, unique and specific signatures of structure and resonance just like atoms and molecules do. Nothing 'personal' was a part of their morphology and resonance either.
These signatures precede our own consciousness, but not consciousness itself. We have simply not seen before what has always been there from the beginning. It has very much to do with *how* we were looking, but that's an answer to a different question.
I think the problem lies with understanding what understanding is. (Correct me if I'm wrong in this regard.)
Understanding is the integration of knowledge into oneself.
We are *literally 'eating' or inserting the dynamics and morphology into our own consciousness!*
The degree to which we share those dynamics and morphology is the extent to which we 'understand' each other.
Insight and wisdom are completely different concepts too. I'll explain them below in my answer to your last question.

Question:
"When we start talking about exchange of that knowledge (e.g. via the resonance) does the term 'precisely' hold?"

Answer:

Precision is not necessarily a part of any exchange of knowledge. Even partially shared dynamics and morphology resonates in unison to some degree.

It is an attribute of my definition, because the definition is precise.

We must not forget how knowledge, wisdom, insight and understanding (even experience) relate to each other.

Knowledge and understanding form a complete contrapositive harmonic field that is fundamental. *There are deeper levels of meaning for both, but that is a different discussion.*

Knowledge takes on agency and understanding takes on communion in their shared morphological and dynamical domain.

Wisdom and insight build another completely different one just as fundamental (Insight takes on agency and wisdom takes on communion).